

**STRATEGY
RESEARCH
PROJECT**

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

**TERRORISM: NATIONAL SECURITY AND STRATEGY
AND A LOCAL THREAT RESPONSE**

BY

**LIEUTENANT COLONEL PHILIP M. DEHENNIS
United States Army**

19971006 146

DTIG QUALITY INSPECTED 4

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:

**Approved for public release.
Distribution is unlimited.**

USAWC CLASS OF 1997



U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA 17013-5050

UNCLASSIFIED

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

**TERRORISM: NATIONAL SECURITY AND STRATEGY AND
A LOCAL THREAT RESPONSE**

by

**Lieutenant Colonel Philip M. DeHennis
United States Army**

**Dr. Phil Williams
Project Advisor**

**DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:
Approved for public
release. Distribution is
unlimited.**

**General Matthew B. Ridgway Center for International Security Studies
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15260**

UNCLASSIFIED

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Philip M. DeHennis (LTC), USA

TITLE: Terrorism: National Security and Strategy and a Local Threat Response

FORMAT: Strategy Research Project

DATE: 20 May 1997 PAGES: 26 CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

Countering terrorism is included as part of the national security strategy. This study examines terrorism as security issue and proposes policy perspectives to help deter, mitigate and respond to a (potential) act. Included in the paper is an overview of current policy and how terrorism evolved to warrant national security concerns.

TERRORISM: National Security and Strategy and A Local Threat Response

INTRODUCTION:

National Security concerns today focus on a number of areas. Among these are: economic prosperity, promoting democracy and enhancing security against aggressive and rogue nation-states. Included with these challenges are the threats of terrorism using conventional or weapons of mass destruction.

The purpose of this study is to examine terrorism as a security issue, discuss current policy and propose alternatives to deter, mitigate and respond to an act of terrorism. Jurisdiction may fall under civilian authority or local (military) commanders of units or installations up through and including the National Command Authority (NCA), depending on the extent of the threat or damage. First and foremost, a need to provide rapid response to meet the needs of a local emergency is necessary.

TERRORISM AND NATIONAL SECURITY:

Emerging security challenges are being introduced every day as new trends dominate the international political scene. Anti-colonial nationalism has shifted the focus from family, tribe and village to the creation of added expectations of national governments.¹ Many nation-states have over-stretched their capabilities by including a vast range of services that they are having difficulty fulfilling.² In some instances, multi-national corporations have taken up the responsibility for providing ‘security’ to the populace. Some corporate executives have even “embraced the idea of a borderless world and the twilight of national sovereignty.”³ Unfortunately, transnational organized criminal organizations and terrorists have done the same.

The population of the planet continues to rise and material resources are becoming excessively strained. This will stretch the legitimacy of even long standing regimes. The inability of governments to cope with violent fragmentation may be the wave of the future.⁴ Leadership of nations will be challenged as they deal with this anti-colonialism and dissident violence. The United States as a world power will be faced with increased hostility as “part of the price of global engagement.”⁵ New emerging states, rogue groups and individuals have developed an enormous appetite for weapons to be used for political competition, forceful suppression of dissidents or even paranoia. As a result, the world is more heavily armed today than it ever has been.

Recently, other factors, especially telecommunications and mass media have risen and contributed to this dramatic increase in terrorist violence since the 1960s. By using mass media, terrorists ensure that anyone can witness live events happening on the other side of the globe. A form of symbiosis exists between the media and terrorism. Terrorists’

acts are a form of political communication and psychological warfare. This fits right into the modern role of using sensationalism in mass communication and playing on emotion generating events that capture the attention of large audiences. Well aware of this, terrorists ‘script their activity accordingly.’ They provide the media with ‘news’ that encapsulates the audience and the media provides the terrorists with an effective way to send their message.⁶ Manipulation of public opinion is critical to the overall strategy of terrorists. The dilemma a liberal democratic society is confronted with is how to downplay the ‘news’ coverage without raising the issue of censorship.

There is always the element of tension between the control of the media and the norms of a democratic society. A democratic society stresses the right of ‘Freedom of the Press,’ with the press being independent of any political control. This is a healthy freedom to have because it provides a forum for critical, public debate. It is important to consider what the effects will be if restrictions are imposed on the media. A question to be addressed then, ‘Is the public’s right to know more important than any other right -- including the right of a society to protect itself?’

‘Kill one - frighten ten thousand’⁷

Terrorism is a cost-effective tool of low intensity conflict that projects psychological intimidation and physical (violent) force in violation of law.⁸ There is a general acceptance that terrorists have a political agenda of some kind and articulate their demands through the use of violence. Even the former Soviet Union, before Gorbachev assumed power, viewed terrorism as one of several forms of armed struggle used by liberation or revolutionary groups.⁹ Since 1989, and embodied in a statement by

Shevardnadze at a UN General Assembly, there has been a change in attitude towards terrorism.

Violence on national, ethnic, or religious grounds must no longer be tolerated.... No support or sympathy should be extended to the so-called movements that allow actions humiliating other nations, or use terroristic, barbaric and inhuman methods in waging their struggle.¹⁰

Open societies, such as democracies, are particularly vulnerable to terrorist attacks, because of their belief and support of civil liberties and individual rights. Government infringement on these rights is not well accepted by the population, unless there is an imminent threat or act in which another has or will be endangered. Therein lies the illegality of infringement on privacy of the terrorist(s), until after an act has been committed.

Terrorists are “shock troops in a war to the death against the values and institutions of a society.”¹¹ This points to similarities between terrorism and totalitarianism. Both are dominated by hostile intent, assume the enemy is everywhere and regard violence as an appropriate means to their political ends. Terrorists also do not normally commit acts of aggression against authoritarian or totalitarian regimes. That is because these governments do not tolerate a free press, necessary for the effective publicity the terrorist desires, while also dealing swiftly and harshly against terrorists without due process of law.

Generally, terrorism is considered to be a violent act of aggression against a legitimate authority or government. People seeking freedom from oppression or subversive overthrow of a government often use it. Violent acts of terrorism have also

been used for rebellious causes against (perceived) wrongful taxation or government corruption. Another aim of terrorism is to make the liberal system of law unworkable by intimidating the population. Acts of terrorism may not have any clear objectives as in cases of mail-bombings or product tampering. These acts are, in essence, criminal in nature.

Developments in technology have taken place at an astounding rate. In a brief lifetime, the atomic, space, computer and information ages have succeeded one another with great rapidity. Communication technology has made it possible to contact any part of the world in minutes; therefore, political issues can be generic or resolved instantly between heads of states. This revolution transcends traditional boundaries between and within societies. Emerging then are new techniques for propaganda, psychological and information warfare, and threats from terrorists.

Defining terrorism is no easy task. At first sight, the notion of, **The threat or use of violence in order to draw attention to or promote a cause** - appears appropriate. But then, consider a study, by the Dutch political scientist, Alex P. Schmidt, who found more than 140 definitions of terrorism written between 1936 and 1981. These definitions identified twenty-two separate elements and twenty purposes or functions.¹² Terror is based from Latin on the verbs *terrere* - to cause to tremble and *deterre* - to frighten. Both forms fit the current day phenomenon of terrorism.

Strength in the use of terrorism stems from not only the act itself but also the reaction by those not directly affected or involved. The terrorist has a kind of subliminal power of the weak over the powerless. This creates an enormous frustration for a government that can be perceived as not being able to provide for the security of its

citizens. Often this is the objective of terrorists, to undermine the public's perception of the governments' ability to rule.¹³ Terrorism used in this manner can be considered a form of psychological warfare, with the immediate objective, not to destroy, but through the use or threat of violence to create an atmosphere of fear.¹⁴

In other cases, terrorists consider themselves part of an ongoing war of oppression. They see the whole of society as the enemy and all members as appropriate objects for violence. Terrorism can then be considered as absolute war because its goal is the absolute destruction of the society. Samuel P. Huntington has implied that a "quasi-war between Islamic groups and the West is currently underway."¹⁵

The categories of terrorists can be considered as: 1.) state sponsored; 2.) state relevant and 3.) state irrelevant. State sponsored terrorists are aided and supported by nation-states (Libya's extension of diplomatic privileges to terrorists). State relevant and state irrelevant terrorists are independent from state control and are able to exist autonomously. State relevant groups exist within the confines of the state with a desire to dominate that state (HAMAS - want to rule Lebanon), while state irrelevant groups pursue an independent agenda (Hizballah - want all nations to submit to Islam),¹⁶ and are not tied geophysically or politically, to one particular state.

A HISTORY OF TERRORISM:

Terrorism has a deep-rooted religious background. An organization that had an early use of terror has been traced to a sect of Muslims known as The Assassins.¹⁷ One of the first crises of Islam occurred after the death of Mohammed, in the year 632. Mohammed left no clear instructions on who was to succeed him as leader of the Islamic

community. For centuries, in-fighting occurred among Islamic sects, and the Ismailis emerged as one sect who many believed was headed by the heir of the Islamic Prophet. A secret sect of the Ismailis, known as The Assassins, was a multi-classed coalition and was among the first to set a precedent for planned, systematic and long-term use of terror as a political weapon. Their terror reigned against other Muslims in Persia, Syria and other parts of the Middle East for hundreds of years. They also made selective assassinations against Christian leaders during the time of the Crusades.

The Assassins were not the first to assassinate. Murder is as old as the human race; its origin in the fourth chapter of Genesis where the first murderer and the victim were brothers. Murder often occurs because of political reasons, such as, when power is vested in an individual (a tyrant) and his quick removal is a simple method of affecting political change. It has been used throughout the ages as a means to effect this change. Ancient Jewish Zealots assassinated Roman occupation forces in crowded public places in Jerusalem during the first century to intimidate others into accepting their ways.

Terrorism, as a word became popular in France during the revolution in the 1790s, known as the 'Reign of Terror'. (When radical *Jacobins* executed members of the aristocracy.) Throughout history, nationalists fighting for liberation have used terroristic violence. It is expected that the use of terrorism will increase in the future. Contemporary terrorism, as part of the national security agenda, has developed since the late 1960s and is coupled with the rapid developments of modern technology. Proliferation of radical groups with violent tendencies is difficult to track in America because of the Civil Rights Act that protects the American citizens' privacy.

An American issue today is the threat of terrorism from two fronts; domestic and international. Notable among the domestic threats are the American militias of the ‘patriot movement.’ Their avowed goal is to prepare for a violent showdown with the ‘satanic’ federal government. Foremost in the international concern are the various militant Islamic groups. They also have as their ultimate destiny the elimination of the ‘great Satan’ the United States.¹⁸ It has been noted that many groups and movements look for “a reaction to what is sometimes viewed as the secular immorality of the West.”¹⁹ Brian Jenkins, a noted authority on terrorism at the Rand Corporation, has stated, “A certain amount of political violence is a price paid for a free and open society.”²⁰

Some recent domestic and international terrorist attacks against U.S. citizens and soldiers have been: the Khobar Towers bombing in Saudi Arabia; the Olympic Park bombing in Atlanta, Georgia; numerous bombing incidents at abortion clinics; mail-bombings of individuals and corporations; bomb blasts at the Alfred P. Murrah Federal building in Oklahoma City, the World Trade Center in New York City and U.S. Marine barracks and embassy in Beirut; Pan American flight 103; hostage taking and murder on-board the cruise ship Achille Lauro and the U.S. embassy in Teheran. The international community, in 1995, witnessed the sarin nerve gas attack in the subway of Tokyo by the Aum Shinrikyo religious cult. Many of the terrorists who committed the above acts have been apprehended, but the cyanide-laced Tylenol incident in the United States a few years ago still remains unresolved.

Organizations who pose a threat are both foreign and domestic and are left-wing, right-wing or based on ethnic movements. Most recently, right-wing groups, such as the Aryan Nations movement, Posse Comitatus, the Ku Klux Klan, the American Nazi Party,

and even Anti-Abortion groups and single individuals (the Unabomber), have threatened or committed acts which are considered terroristic. There is considerable concern that Islamic fundamentalist groups have already built a terrorist infrastructure here in this country.²¹ President Clinton has been quoted as saying that international terrorism is the greatest security challenge of the 21st century.²² Noted organizations that have plagued the international scene in recent times are; the Basque in Spain, Tamil Tigers in Sri Lanka, Baader-Meinhof in Germany, Red Brigades in Italy, the Japanese Red Army, the Irish Republican Army and the Palestinian Liberation Organization. Threats from emerging terrorism appear to be increasing from two types of groups. The first is a severely despondent group with a harsh sense of despair and alienation of the developing world (the have-nots). The second has a commonality to cults.²³ Both have an ultimate goal to undermine the existing governmental powers and in essence, border on 'criminal anarchy'.²⁴

TERRORISM - OLD THREATS/NEW THREATS:

Tools of the terrorist are conventional weapons of terror: bombings, hijackings, kidnappings, maimings, assassinations and facility attacks. They also could be weapons of mass destruction. Indeed, the two most discussed and publicly worried about threats to U.S. security have been the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, terrorism, and a possible link between the two.²⁵ The weapons of mass destruction of consideration are nuclear, chemical and biological. There is also growing speculation on infoterrorism and cyber-warfare as weapons of the future.²⁶

The specter of nuclear terrorism has not been a primary issue of late. But the threat of a nuclear bomb being developed by a renegade state or terrorist group is real. Evidence points to nuclear material smuggling out of Russia and the former Soviet Union States because of insufficient security.²⁷ This presents a significant challenge to our national defense. It has been estimated by Thomas B. Cochran of the Natural Resources Defense Council in Washington, DC that a nuclear bomb would require between three and twenty-five kilograms of enriched uranium or between one and eight kilograms of plutonium.²⁸ A kilogram of plutonium would occupy approximately one seventh the size of a standard aluminum soft drink can. Cited from German statistics, there have been 700 cases of attempted nuclear materials smuggling in Russia between 1991 and 1994, while the Russian government reported 900 attempts by people trying to illegally enter Russian facilities.²⁹ At present, there is concern that Russian organized crime is or will become involved in nuclear material smuggling. The number of countries possessing nuclear weapons or are seeking the capability to produce and deliver them is approaching two dozen.³⁰

Of greatest concern is the country of Iran, which is actively pursuing a nuclear program for energy and is suspected to be only a few years away from producing a nuclear bomb. The risk of Iran having these capabilities has ramifications in respect to the state sponsored terrorism that it supports. Other rogue states, such as Libya, have also been interested in gaining a nuclear weapons capability. Libya too, has supported terrorists. Although it has been noted that most terrorist groups do not have the financial resources or technological means to develop a nuclear weapon, other types of radiological dispersion devices could be made.³¹

The number of countries with chemical and biological weapons is rising. The cost of acquiring a stockpile of chemical or biological weapons is small compared with the cost of achieving nuclear capability. Biological and chemical agents are relatively easy to procure because the technology associated with their manufacture is readily available.

Chemical weapons are toxic substances with effects on exposed personnel, which result in incapacitation or death. These weapons are classified on the basis of a number of physical and chemical properties. Lethal agents are designed primarily to cause fatalities, while nonlethal agents are designed to incapacitate or injure but can also kill in large enough doses. Chemical agents act through inhalation, ingestion or percutaneously (through eyes, skin or mucous membranes). They can react rapidly, almost instantaneously or take up to several weeks or months before symptoms occur.

Persistence of an agent is the measure of the length of time the chemical remains as a hazard. Nonpersistent agents are rather volatile and evaporate quickly, usually within a few minutes to an hour. Semi-persistent agents generally linger for several hours to about a day. While persistent agents, which tend to be rather thick and oily, can last for several days to a few weeks.

First generation chemical agents are choking (chlorine and phosgene), blood (hydrogen cyanide and cyanogen chloride), and blister (sulfur mustard, nitrogen mustard and lewsite). Second generation, G-series nerve agents, include tabun, sarin and soman and are similar to pesticides. The third generation chemical agents are V-series nerve agents, similar to G-series, but more advanced. Nonlethal chemical agents include tear gas, vomiting agents, and psychochemicals such as lysergic acid diethylamine and benactyzine. Most of the chemical agents, particularly the first generation ones, are fairly simple to

produce and many agents are made commercially because of their civilian or industrial uses.³²

Biological weapons are the use of pathogens or toxins and are inherently more lethal than chemical weapons on a weight-for-weight basis. They are potentially more effective than chemical weapons. Some occur naturally, such as bacteria and viruses. Unlike nuclear and chemical weapons, there are no reliable detection devices. Biological organisms can be produced to attack material, crops and livestock as well as people.³³

There is often a delay in the onset of symptoms from biological weapons. This makes it difficult to determine the time and place of initial occurrence or outbreak. Compounding the issue of many biological agents or infectious diseases is a time factor requiring immediate reaction upon discovery of an outbreak. "Today, an infectious pathogen, such as an influenza, can easily travel around the world in a matter of hours."³⁴

Essentially all equipment, technology and materials required for biological agent production is also used for research in developing vaccines. Biological threat agents include organisms that cause anthrax, botulism, tularemia and the plague. These and other organisms represent numerous clinical pathogens currently undergoing research for eradication and control. This presents a significant difficulty in determining which facilities are being used for legitimate purposes.

Through the biotechnological and genetic engineering advances that have taken place, it is possible to mass-produce lethal organisms and toxins that previously were only available in small, insignificant quantities. As such, a serious threat exists for potential terroristic use.³⁵ General Colin Powell identified this in 1993 as an inherent weakness to U.S. security interests. In his words:

The one (WMD) that scares me to death, perhaps even more so than tactical nuclear weapons, and the one we have the least capability against is biological weapons.³⁶

Almost any infectious microorganism that has lethal effects on plants, animals or humans has a potential as a biological weapon.³⁷

Because of the growing dependence of advanced societies on the use of electronic storage and transmission of information, there is considerable concern about the use of cyber-warfare. Already the issue of electronic money transfers and money laundering by organized crime groups has been identified as a security measure that must be dealt with.

Other vulnerabilities exist in areas of defense, transportation, and finance. Russian hackers, who in 1994 transferred \$10 million from Citibank's cash-management system, evidence this. Estimates in lost U.S. economy to computer hackers, in 1996 range from \$2 to \$4 billion.³⁸ Shutting down an entire electrical energy system or engaging in illicit federal funding transfers and transactions may be targets of terrorists. Extreme destructive power can be at the hands of those who can penetrate an electronic security system. Information warfare may even pose a threat greater than any biological or chemical weapon.³⁹

Because an information system has many points of access, it becomes virtually impossible to trace an illegal point of entry.

In a search for identity, information warfare can be broken down into several distinct forms.

Command-and-control warfare (C2W) encompasses the objective to destroy the command structure of the enemy to prevent effective use of forces. Intelligence-based warfare (IBW) involves the control of the integrated (hardware) systems that collect and disseminate information. Electronic warfare (EW) engages the operational

techniques used in the transfer of information such as digital logic and electromagnetic manipulation (jamming), radio-electronics and cryptography. Psychological warfare (PSYW) uses information against the mind and includes operations and deception against the national will, commanders, troops and cultural conflict. Hacker warfare refers to attacks on computer networks and information systems. Economic information warfare (EIW) can be considered as targeted trade imbalances by blocking or channeling information for economic dominance. Cyberwarfare is broadly defined as infoterrorism utilizing a manipulation of information, misinformation or simulation.⁴⁰

Each type of information warfare in itself poses a significant threat either to military forces or to a population in general. Some of the forms, such as hacker, psychological or cyber-warfare may be more conducive for use by a terrorist than other forms. Protection against any form requires serious consideration. The Defense Information System Agency has estimated that in 1995, there were 250,000 attacks against the Defense Department's computers. These attacks were 65 percent were successful.⁴¹ As noted by former Senator Sam Nunn regarding any society reliant on electronic communication systems, "You can't really tell where the hacking is coming from -- whether it is an espionage agent or someone who is just pulling a prank, bent on destructiveness for its own sake. We have to watch capabilities being developed that could disrupt America's systems...."⁴²

TERRORISM - PRESENT POLICY AND PREPAREDNESS:

Current U. S. Policy in countering international terrorists is: make no concessions to terrorists, pressure state sponsors of terrorism, exploit legal means to punish international terrorists and help other governments to improve their capabilities to combat terrorism. Countering domestic terrorism is a coordinated effort among Executive Branch

agencies. The agencies that apprehend terrorist perpetrators integrate diplomatic and rule-of -law activities.⁴³ Laws and treaties have been enacted to prevent and minimize terrorist acts. They also are designed to prevent the use or manufacture of chemical, biological and nuclear weapons. Other measures to counter terrorism include increasing airline security, improving detection methods and equipment relating to explosives, and coordinating intelligence efforts.

The Comprehensive Terrorism Prevention Act seeks to prevent and punish acts of terrorism. Ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention is intended to ban development, production, acquisition, stockpiling, retention and transfer of chemical weapons. Since the adoption of the Biological and Toxic Weapons Convention our nation has only maintained a defensive program as a deterrent. The U.S. is one of over 170 signatories to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. With all these measures the United States has taken a leadership role in limiting weapons of mass destruction and attempting to deter the threat from terrorism.

The current (Military) Joint Doctrine for Mobilization Planning provides for a Graduated Response (GR) in managing a national crisis.⁴⁴ This is a stepped or tiered process that begins at the local level. Local authorities (police, fire and emergency management personnel) normally are the first to arrive on the scene of an emergency, incident or disaster. Once it has been determined local assets have or will be exhausted, State assistance is requested through the Office of the Governor. If State assets under the Governor's authority are insufficient, the Governor requests Federal assistance through the President. The President has the authority under the Stafford Disaster Relief and

Emergency Assistance Act (PL 100-707) to appoint FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency) to coordinate the additional support.

Essentially, every Federal agency has a role in supporting a national emergency. Under the Federal Response Plan (PL 93-288) operations are grouped into twelve Emergency Support Functions (ESFs); Transportation, Communications, Public Works and Engineering, Firefighting, Information and Planning, Mass Care, Resource Support, Health and Medical Support, Urban Search and Rescue, Hazardous Materials, Food, and Energy. FEMA coordinates the efforts of all federal agencies and departments, depending on the needs of the State.⁴⁵ It is essential though, that resources at the local level be used first since these assets are usually closer to the scene both in distance of proximity, as well as time to coordinate efficient response. There is also a matter of cost, although considerations for the safety and security of citizens should be paramount.

Before military forces are deployed in support of emergency disaster relief operations, consideration needs to be with specific guidance and approval given under United States Code, Title 10, Sections 331-333, 371-380 and 637b(b). These sections outline authority for mobilization as well as limitations for military forces in support civil law enforcement. Active and reserve forces can only be deployed under a Presidential Decision Directive (PDD). State National Guard forces are mobilized under the Governor's authority for State duty or under a PDD for Federal duty. There are certain life-threatening situations when local (military) commanders may respond quickly. These are when imminently serious conditions resulting from an emergency situation that requires immediate action to save lives, prevent human suffering or mitigate great property damage. Approval to act must be requested immediately through channels.

Located in Emmitsburg, Maryland, are the Institute for National Emergency Management Training and the National Fire Academy. These facilities conduct training and exercises to improve emergency preparedness. Many Local, State and Federal agencies and departments take advantage of these centers to develop response skills. Last year, the Emergency Management Institute had more than 35,000 people enrolled in independent study programs.

Army facilities around the world will be assessed for force protection. This is in response to the Khobar Towers bombing attack that killed 19 U.S. airmen. Twelve-member, Army Force Protection Assistance Teams include experts in physical security, operations, intelligence, chemical-biological defense, medical response, protective design, risk management, information operations, law enforcement and resource management.⁴⁶ Their assessment will help to supplement the local (facility) commander's force protective posture, make provisions for improvement as needed and increase the security awareness priority.

TERRORISM - POLICY PROPOSALS:

It is the intent of this study to provide a basis for deterring, mitigating and responding to a (catastrophic) terrorist act: in essence to 'manage' terrorism because the threat, in some form or another, will always be there. It would be utopian to believe otherwise. Defense, mitigation and response to a terrorist act require significant planning and coordination for swift and beneficial support to this national security issue. Dealing with terrorism is not a policy option that can be set aside for future generations.

Confronting the issue of terrorism is necessary for the survival of a democratic society.

Numerous actions can be taken at all levels to help combat the threat of terrorism.

1. Education of citizens, soldiers, leaders and officials needs to be taken more seriously. A recent poll by the Pew Research Center in Washington, DC, found that although 72% of the respondents understood that attacks, such as the ones in Tokyo and Oklahoma City, could occur, only 13% were worried. Senator Richard G. Lugar (Republican - Indiana) noted, "There is almost a sense of denial out there in the public."⁴⁷ An abundance of informational brochures and pamphlets on terrorism are available from FEMA, along with many 'Web-Sites' providing information on 'guarding against terror.' Increasing awareness will help to both deter an act and provide alternatives for response if one does occur. Publicizing the Department of State's International Terrorism Information Rewards Program will aid in apprehending offenders. This program financially rewards individuals who provide information leading to the prosecution or prevention of acts of terrorism.

2. Tracking terrorists is no easy task, but sharing information among intelligence agencies will help to improve law enforcement initiatives. Cooperation between inter- and intra-agencies at all levels of government and law enforcement is absolutely necessary to bring the right forces together for apprehension. During and just after the Gulf War, there were nearly 200 attacks, worldwide, by terrorists sympathetic to Saddam Hussain. Most were minimized because intelligence was shared.⁴⁸ The one critical issue not easy to solve is the Civil Rights of the individual. Agencies cannot overstep their bounds when dealing with citizens.

3. The initiative undertaken by the U.S. Army, as noted earlier, in the Force Protection Assistance Team is taking a pro-active approach to the threat of terrorism. Agencies and departments at all levels (local, State and Federal) need to utilize this type of activity. By putting together an assessment team, experts could then develop a hardening approach to highly attractive targets and facilities. This would be particularly effective at the local level where officials and agencies are the first on the scene when needed. The assessment from their perspective would take into account known capabilities (police, fire, Haz-Mat, Guard and Reserve units) within their jurisdiction and how best to apportion these assets to mitigate a threat.

4. Develop training programs to enhance responsiveness to a crisis, especially at the local level. It is advantageous to use a Local Terrorism Planning Model available from FEMA, the Institute for National Emergency Training or on the InterNet and participate in exercises where critical issues can be brought out. For example, it was found during an exercise in Los Angeles that hospitals normally would open their doors to victims of a disaster. But, in this case, a simulated chemical weapons incident, hospitals needed to guard their doors and decontaminate the victims first before admitting them. A non-notice, simulated nerve gas exercise conducted in a New York City subway would have contaminated a number of police and firefighters who responded without protective masks and clothing.⁴⁹ Incorporating all agencies, to include fire departments, Haz-Mat teams and National Guards units will build the cohesiveness and cooperation between these agencies necessary if a situation occurs.

5. Providing improved detection devices is essential in minimizing a terrorist attack. New technological advances in detection equipment for explosives and weapons,

as well as alarms, barriers and access control are continuing to be developed. Not only are local jurisdictions lacking efficient equipment, availability is just not there. For example, a deficiency in the current U.S. biological weapons posture is the lack of a rapid and accurate detection system.⁵⁰ This needs proper priority so that agencies will be able to carry out an effective incident response. Use of computer software “firewalls” and virus detectors are essential to preventing a breach of electronic security systems and must be used to the fullest extent possible.

6. Aggressive apprehension of terrorists is needed by law enforcement agencies that now have more authority with the enactment of the Comprehensive Terrorist Prevention Act. The purpose of this act is to prevent and punish individuals who have committed acts of terrorism. There is still the unresolved issue of international law enforcement. There is no mechanism for enforcing international law and as such, the UN could provide a basis for establishing a means of maintaining international stability. This may be a very tenuous situation because some members of the United Nations have or are sponsors of terrorists or terrorist affiliated groups.

7. On a moralistic level, terrorism needs to be condemned by civilized society with the same tenacity that piracy and international slave trade were fought. Because democracies distinguish between legal and illegal use of violence, individuals or groups who use violence to coerce or intimidate a government to yield to their demands must be apprehended. A graduated response up to and including decisive military retaliation against states known to sponsored terrorism, or the use of Special Operations Forces against non-state sponsored groups may be required.

SUMMARY:

This study examined terrorism as a security issue including an overview of current policy. Proposals of additional policy perspectives were made to deter, mitigate and respond to terrorism. These proposals include:

1. Educate.
2. Share information.
3. Take a pro-active approach.
4. Develop training programs.
5. Provide improved detection devices.
6. Apprehend offenders.
7. Retaliate decisively.

CONCLUSION:

It is difficult to measure the successes of terrorism. Many innocent people have been killed or victimized at the hands of terrorists. This is indeed unfortunate. Some governments have been overthrown. But then there is not always a clear distinction between revolutionaries, (guerrillas) and terrorists. Certainly the high cost and lengthy inconveniences of international airline travel were not an ultimate objective of terrorists.⁵¹ Some ransoms have been paid. It can be expected that this will continue. It has proven to be fairly safe for the terrorist to commit an act of (extreme) violence. Many nations harbor terrorists, their crimes are highly publicized while they remain powerfully anonymous.

Internal security of democratic nations has increasingly come under the threat from terrorism, subversion and crime and the defeat of these concerns depend on the rule of law. To reinforce the security, a substantial fear among terrorists and criminals of being caught and the seriousness of consequences needs to be implemented. To help in this endeavor active cooperation and vigilance by citizens to provide information to support evidence for conviction is required. The theme of 'local awareness' should abound.

Considering the issues we face today, in the age of weapons of mass destruction, information warfare and the conventional weapons that are all at the disposal of a terrorist, one would not have difficulty imagining another catastrophic event being caused by an individual or group. Answers to questions, such as, where will it happen, when will it take place, against whom will it be directed, of course, can only be speculative. It may be more fitting to consider the alternatives provided and 'prepare for the common defense' within the bounds and limitations of the money and time available. To this extent, there are numerous measures, as noted, that soldiers, citizens, leaders and officials can undertake to help deter, mitigate or respond to an incident.

ENDNOTES

¹Amos A. Jordan, Lawrence J. Korb and William J. Taylor, Jr., American National Security: Policy and Process (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1993), 17.

²Steven Metz, Strategic Horizons: The Military Implications of Alternative Futures (Carlisle, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, 1997), 10.

³Phil Williams, "Getting Rich and Getting Even: Transnational Threats in the Twenty-first Century," Unpublished manuscript.

⁴Daniel Bell, "The Future World Disorder," Foreign Policy 27 (Summer 1977): 109-35. See also, Amos A. Jordan, Lawrence J. Korb and William J. Taylor, Jr., American National Security: Policy and Process (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1993), 18.

⁵Steven Metz, "To Insure Domestic Tranquillity: Terrorism and The Price of Global Engagement," in Terrorism: National Security Policy and the Home Front, ed. Stephen C. Pelletiere (Carlisle, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, 1995), 77.

⁶Peter Chalk, Western European Terrorism and Counter-Terrorism, (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996), 110.

⁷Sun Tzu

⁸U.S. Congress, Office of Technology Assessment, Technology Against Terrorism: The Federal Effort, OTA-ISC-481 (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, July 1991), 17.

⁹Galia Golan, "Gorbachev's 'New Thinking' on Terrorism," The Washington Papers 141 (New York: Praeger, 1990), 87.

¹⁰Ibid., 89.

¹¹Jean J. Kirkpatrick, "The Totalitarian Confusion" in Terrorism: How the West Can Win ed. Benjamin Netanyahu (New York: Farrar-Straus-Giroux, 1986), 57.

¹²Richard J. Erickson, Legitimate Use of Military Force Against State-Sponsored International Terrorism, (Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama: Air University Press, 1989), 24.

¹³Richard J. Erickson, Legitimate Use of Military Force Against State-Sponsored International Terrorism, (Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama: Air University Press, 1989), 39. See also Robert Grant, "Terrorism: What Shall We Do?" in Terrorism, ed. Steven Anzovin (New York: Wilson, 1986), 160.

¹⁴Peter Chalk, Western European Terrorism and Counter-Terrorism, (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996), 13.

¹⁵Samuel P. Huntington, The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order, (New York: Simon and Shuster, 1996), 216-217.

¹⁶Brett A McCrea, "U.S. Counter-Terrorist Policy: A Proposed Strategy for a Nontraditional Threat," Ridgway Viewpoints No. 94-1 (Pittsburgh, PA: Ridgway Center for International Security Studies), 2-4.

¹⁷Bernard Lewis, The Assassins (New York: Basic Books, 1968), 10.

¹⁸Benjamin Netanyahu, Fighting Terrorism: How Democracies Can Defeat Domestic and International Terrorism (New York: Farrar-Straus-Giroux, 1995), 6.

¹⁹Stephen Sloan, "Terrorism: How Vulnerable is the United States?" in Terrorism: National Security Policy and the Home Front, ed. Stephen C. Pelletiere (Carlisle, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, 1995), 63.

²⁰Richard J. Erickson, Legitimate Use of Military Force Against State-Sponsored International Terrorism, (Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama: Air University Press, 1989), 45. See also, Brian Michael Jenkins, "Fighting Terrorism: An Enduring Task," RAND 6585, (Santa Monica, CA: RAND, 1981), 4.

²¹Bruce Hoffman, Terrorism in the United States and the Potential Threat to Nuclear Facilities (Santa Monica, California: RAND, 1986), 20.

²²Neil C. Livingstone, "Failure: America's Misdirected Efforts to Combat Terrorism and Recommendations For a More Effective Policy" in Center for Global Security and Cooperation Monograph "Toward 2000" Series, No. 4, 16.

²³Phil Williams, "Getting Rich and Getting Even: Transnational Threats in the Twenty-first Century," Unpublished manuscript.

²⁴Robert D. Kaplan, "The Coming Anarchy," in The Atlantic Monthly, February 1994, 44-76. See also, Helen E. Purkitt, World Politics 96/97 (Guilford, CT: Brown and Benchmark, 1996), 8-12.

²⁵Harlan K. Ullman, In Irons: U.S. Military Might in the New Century (Washington, DC: National Defense University Press, 1995), 54.

²⁶Walter Laqueur, "Postmodern Terrorism," Foreign Affairs, September/October 1996, 35.

²⁷Phil Williams and Paul N. Woesser, "The Real Threat of Nuclear Smuggling," Scientific American, January 1996: 28.

²⁸Ibid., 27.

²⁹Neil C. Livingstone, "Failure: America's Misdirected Efforts to Combat Terrorism and Recommendations For a More Effective Policy" in Center for Global Security and Cooperation Monograph "Toward 2000" Series, No. 4, 16.

³⁰Patrick Clawson, ed. Strategic Assessment 1996 (Washington, DC: National Defense University Press, 1996), 199.

³¹Walter Laqueur, "Postmodern Terrorism," Foreign Affairs, September/October 1996, 29.

³²Congress, Senate, Committee on Governmental Affairs, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, Global Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction Part I, 104th Congress, 1st session, October 31 and November 1, 1995, 503-509.

³³Randall J. Larsen and Robert P. Kadlec, "Biological Warfare: A Post Cold War Threat to America's Strategic Mobility Forces," Ridgway Viewpoints, No. 95-4 (Pittsburgh, PA: Ridgway Center for International Security Studies), 5.

³⁴Lester R. Brown, ed., State of the World 1996 (New York: Bantam Books, 1996), 123.

³⁵Congress, Senate, Committee on Governmental Affairs, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, Global Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction Part I, 104th Congress, 1st session, October 31 and November 1, 1995, 526-533.

³⁶Randall J. Larsen and Robert P. Kadlec, "Biological Warfare: A Post Cold War Threat to America's Strategic Mobility Forces," Ridgway Viewpoints, No. 95-4 (Pittsburgh, PA: Ridgway Center for International Security Studies), 1.

³⁷Congress, Senate, Committee on Governmental Affairs, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, Global Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction Part I, 104th Congress, 1st session, October 31 and November 1, 1995, 526.

³⁸Trent D. McNeeley, "Hackers, Crackers and Trackers," American Legion, February 1997, 68.

³⁹Walter Laqueur, "Postmodern Terrorism," Foreign Affairs, September/October 1996, 35.

⁴⁰Martin C. Libicki, What is Information Warfare? (Washington, DC: National Defense University Press, 1995), 86-104.

⁴¹Trent D. McNeeley, "Hackers, Crackers and Trackers," American Legion, February 1997, 34.

⁴²Trent D. McNeeley, "Hackers, Crackers and Trackers," American Legion, February 1997, 66.

⁴³William J. Clinton, A National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement, (Washington, DC: The White House, 1996), 15.

⁴⁴Department of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Joint Doctrine for Mobilization Planning, Joint Pub 4-05 (Washington, DC: Department of the Joint Chiefs Of Staff, 22 June 1995), I-3.

⁴⁵Ibid.

⁴⁶John Grady, ed, Washington Update Vol. 9, No. 4 (Arlington, VA: AUSA Institute of Land Warfare, 1997), 7.

⁴⁷John J. Fialka, "U.S. Cities Prepare to Deal With Terror Attacks, But Drills Point to Weakness in Rescue Plans," Wall Street Journal, June 3, 1996, sec. A, p. 12.

⁴⁸Robert H. Kupperman and David M. Smith, "Coping With Biological Terrorism" in Biological Weapons: Weapons of the Future?, ed. Brad Roberts (Washington, DC: Center for Strategic and International Studies, 1993), 35-36.

⁴⁹John J. Fialka, "U.S. Cities Prepare to Deal With Terror Attacks, But Drills Point to Weakness in Rescue Plans," Wall Street Journal, June 3, 1996, sec. A, p. 12.

⁵⁰Thomas Dashiell, "A Review of U.S. Biological Warfare Policies," in Biological Weapons: Weapons of the Future?, ed. Brad Roberts (Washington, DC: Center for Strategic and International Studies, 1993), 6.

⁵¹Earl H. Fry, Stan A. Taylor and Robert S. Wood, America the Vincible (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1994), 224.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bell, Daniel. "The Future World Disorder." Foreign Policy 27, Summer 1977, 109-35.
- Brown, Lester R., ed. State of the World 1996. New York: Norton, 1996.
- Chalk, Peter. Western European Terrorism and Counter-terrorism: The Evolving Dynamic. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996.
- Clawson, Patrick, ed. Strategic Assessment 1996. Washington, DC: National Defense University Press, 1996.
- Clinton, William J. A National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement. Washington, DC: The White House, February 1996.
- Clutterbuck, Richard. Terrorism in an Unstable World. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Dashiell, Thomas. "A Review of U.S. Biological Warfare Policies" in Biological Weapons: Weapons of the Future?, ed. Brad Roberts, 1-6. Washington, DC: Center for Strategic and International Studies, 1993.
- Department of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Joint Doctrine for Mobilization Planning. Joint Pub 4-05. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, 22 June 1995.
- Erickson, Richard J. Legitimate Use of Military Force Against State-Sponsored International Terrorism. Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama: Air University Press, 1989.
- Fialka, John J. "U.S. Cities Prepare to Deal With Terror Attacks, But Drills Point to Weakness in Rescue Plans," Wall Street Journal, June 3, 1996, sec. A, p.16.
- Fry, Earl H., Stan A. Taylor and Robert S. Wood. America the Vincible. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1994.
- Golan, Galia. "Gorbachev's 'New Thinking' on Terrorism." The Washington Papers/141. New York: Praeger, 1990.
- Grady, John, ed. Washington Update, Vol. 9 No. 4, Washington, DC: AUSA Institute for Land Warfare, 1997.
- Hoffman, Bruce. Terrorism and the Potential Threat to Nuclear Facilities in the United States. Santa Monica, CA: Rand, 1986.

- Huntington, Samuel P. The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order. New York: Simon and Shuster, 1996.
- Jordan, Amos A., Lawrence J. Korb and William J. Taylor, Jr. American National Security: Policy and Process. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1993.
- Kaplan, David E. and Andrew Marshall. The Cult at the End of the World. New York: Crown, 1996.
- Kaplan, Robert, D. "The Coming Anarchy." The Atlantic Monthly. February 1994, 44-76.
- Kupperman, Robert H. Facing Tomorrow's Terrorist Incident Today. Law Enforcement Assistance Agency, U.S. Department of Justice. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, October 1977.
- Kupperman, Robert H. and David M. Smith. "Coping with Biological Terrorism," in Biological Weapons: Weapons of the Future?, ed. Brad Roberts, 35-46. Washington, DC: Center for Strategic and International Studies, 1993.
- Laqueur, Walter. "Postmodern Terrorism." Foreign Affairs. September/October 1996, 24-36.
- Larsen, Randell J. and Kadlac, Robert P. "Biological Warfare: A Post Cold War Threat to America's Strategic Mobility Forces." Ridgway Viewpoints, No. 95-4, 1995.
- Lewis, Bernard. The Assassins. New York: Basic Books, 1968.
- Libicki, Martin C. What is Information Warfare? Washington, DC: National Defense University, 1995.
- Livingstone, Neil C. "Failure: America's Misdirected Efforts to Combat Terrorism and Recommendations for a More Effective Policy." The Center for Global Security and Cooperation Monograph "Toward 2000" Series, No. 4, 1997.
- Morganthau, Hans J. Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace, 5th ed. New York: Knopf, 1973.
- Metz, Steven. Strategic Horizons: The Military Implications of Alternative Futures. Carlisle, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, March 7, 1997.
- Metz, Steven. "To Insure Domestic Tranquility: Terrorism and the Price of Global Engagement." in Terrorism: National Security Policy and the Home Front, ed. Stephen C. Pelletiere, 77-87. Carlisle, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, May 15, 1995.

McNeeley, Trent D. "Hackers, Crackers and Trackers." American Legion, February 1997, 34-36, 66 & 68.

Netanyahu, Benjamin. Terrorism: How the West Can Win. New York: Farrar-Straus-Giroux, 1986.

Netanyahu, Benjamin. Fighting Terrorism: How Democracies Can Defeat Domistic and International Terrorists. New York: Farrar-Straus-Giroux, 1995.

Paret, Peter, ed. The Makers of Modern Strategy: from Machiavelli to the Nuclear Age. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986.

Pelletiere, Stephen C., ed. Terrorism: National Security policy and the Home Front. Carlisle, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, May 15, 1995.

Purkitt, Helen E., ed. World Politics 96/97. Guilford, CT: Brown and Benchmark, 1996.

Quarles, Chester L. Terrorism: Avoidance and Survival. Stoneham, MA: Butterworth-Heinemann, 1991.

Roberts, Brad. Biological Weapons: Weapons of the Future?, Washington, DC: Center for Strategic and International Studies, 1993.

Schweizer, Peter. "Terror: Tehran's Chief Export." American Legion, March 1997, 26-29.

Sloan, Stephen. "Terrorism: How Vulnerable is the United States?" in Terrorism: National Security Policy and the Home Front, ed. Stephen C. Pelletiere, 61-75. Carlisle, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, May 15, 1995.

Summers, Harry G. Jr. The New World Strategy: A Military Policy for America's Future. New York: Simon and Shuster, 1995.

Szumski, Bonnie. "Terrorism." Opposing Viewpoints Series. St. Paul, MN: Greenhaven Press, 1986.

Toffler, Alvin and Heidi Toffler. War and Anti-war: Survival at the Dawn of the 21st Century. New York: Little, Brown and Company, 1993.

Toffler, Alvin. Powershift: Knowledge, Wealth and Violence at the Edge of the the 21st Century. New York: Bantam Books, 1990.

Ullman, Harlan K. In Irons: U.S. Military Might in the New Century. Washington, DC: National Defense University Press, 1995.

U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Governmental Affairs, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. Global Proliferations of Weapons of Mass Destruction Part I. 104th Congress, 1st session, October 31 and November 1, 1995.

U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Governmental Affairs, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. Global Proliferations of Weapons of Mass Destruction Part II. 104th Congress, 2nd session, March 13, 20 and 22, 1996.

U.S. Congress. Office of Technology Assessment. Technology Against Terrorism: The Federal Effort. OTA-ISC-481. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, July 1991.

Whitson, William W. Foreign Policy and U.S. National Security. New York: Praeger, 1976

Williams, Phil. "Getting Rich and Getting Even: Transnational Threats in the Twenty-first Century." Unpublished manuscript.

Williams, Phil and Paul Woessner. "The Real Threat of Nuclear Smuggling." Scientific American, January 1996, 26-30.